

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 56-84 are pending.

Claims 14-55 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

Claims 1-8, 56-64, 70-78, and 84 stand rejected.

Claims 9-13, 65-69, and 79-83 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, and have been amended to overcome the objection.

Claims 1, 57, 70, and 71 have been amended.

Claims 85 has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 70 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 70 to properly depend from claim 57.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 56-64, 70-78, and 84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Meyer article “eWorkbench: Real-Time Tracking of Synchronized Goals” (hereinafter “*Meyer*”) and “Making Reviews More Efficient and Fair” (hereinafter “*Dutton*”) in view of CultureWorx, as disclosed in *Dutton*, and further in view of “Power-Charging People’s Performance” (referred to herein as “*Elliot*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 57, and 71 include “storing a primary goal of the first goal type”, “determining content for a user interface, based on the first and second rules, such that the content directs a user of the user interface in generation of content of a secondary goal of the second goal type that causes alignment of the secondary goal with the primary goal of the first goal type”. Claims 1, 57, and 71 further include “determining, with the computer system, if the primary goal has been modified” and “if the primary goal has been determined to have been modified, generating an alignment warning with the

computer system to provide notice regarding alignment between the modified primary goal and the secondary goal.” Claims 7-11, 65-67, and 77-11 also relate to alignment information and alignment warnings. Objected to claims 9, 65, 79 specifically relate to “highlighting the alignment warning object in response to determining that the parent goal has been modified.”

Meyer teaches a system referred to as ‘eWorkbench’ that “lets managers and line employees create and track goals, and align them with their employer’s broad objectives.” *Meyer*, para. 2. Once a goal is entered using eWorkbench, “By clicking on the “Align” button, the user is presented with a list of his manager’s goals; he then clicks on the appropriate one to link it with his own.” *Id.*, para. 4. In subsequent paragraphs, *Meyer* teaches that progress towards goals can be checked and updated.

Dutton teaches that CultureWorx allows communication and administration of incremental sales and rewards programs. *Dutton*, para. 23. “Coaching is also an integral part of Quill’s program.” *Id.*, para. 24. The coaching to by *Dutton* relates to managers coaching employees about the employee’s performance. More specifically, “For managers, such realtime, continuous-feedback systems can help them provide specific performance information before ineffective behaviors become bad habits.” *Id.*, para. 25.

Elliot reiterates the importance of an organization’s ability to effectively communicate organization goals. *Elliot* relates to the improvement of employee work performance through understanding of the goals of the employee’s organization, identifying major accomplishments that support those goals, and assistance in meeting those goals. See, *Elliot*, Abstract and paras. 13 and 18. However, Applicants respectfully submit that *Elliot* does not provide any technical or non-technical teachings or solutions regarding goal alignment “if the primary goal has been modified.” Claims 1, 57, and 71.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Meyer* in view of *Dutton* and *Elliot* fails to teach or suggest a system or method that addresses modification of a primary goal and corresponding alignment issues. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit *Meyer* in view of *Dutton* and *Elliot* fails to teach or suggest “determining content for a user interface, based on the first and second rules, such that the content directs a user of the

user interface in generation of content of a secondary goal of the second goal type that causes alignment of the secondary goal with the primary goal of the first goal type”. Claims 1, 57, and 71. Claims 1, 57, and 71 further include “determining, with the computer system, if the primary goal has been modified” and “if the primary goal has been determined to have been modified, generating an alignment warning with the computer system to provide notice regarding alignment between the modified primary goal and the secondary goal.”

The January 29, 2007 Office Action, p. 3, para. 3 states that “the mere alert or conveyance of the fact that goals are misaligned is enough to direct a user of the user interface to make changes to his/her secondary goals in order to facilitate alignment of the user’s secondary goals with the primary goals.” Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants could locate no teachings or suggestions in *Meyer*, *Dutton*, or *Elliot* for even “determining, with the computer system, if the primary goal has been modified” and, thus, no teachings or suggestions relating to “if the primary goal has been determined to have been modified, generating an alignment warning with the computer system to provide notice regarding alignment between the modified primary goal and the secondary goal.” Claims 1, 57, and 71.

Applicants respectfully submit that for the foregoing reasons *Meyer* in view of *Dutton* and *Elliot* fails to teach or suggest claims 1, 57, and 71.

For at least the same reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims directly or indirectly dependent upon claims 1, 57, or 71 are also allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8, 56-64, 70-78, and 84.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

FILED ELECTRONICALLY
July 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent B. Chambers/

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839